

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-29, 34-53, 55-65 and 67-74 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Objections to the claims and the specification have been asserted. By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, 46, 47, 51, 53, 61, 62, 64, 67, and 68 have been amended. Claims 4 and 30, which were previously canceled without prejudice, have been reinstated and amended. Claim 65 has been canceled without prejudice. Reconsideration of the claim rejections and objection and the specification objections is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The specification was objected to for the reasons stated on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection. Examiner asserts, without any explanation as to why the "topological sorting algorithm" in the incorporated reference "Introduction to Algorithms", comprises "essential material". However, as articulated in MPEP 608.01(p), for example, "essential material" is defined as that which is necessary to satisfy the written description, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

It is respectfully submitted that the specific details regarding the "topological sorting algorithm" is not essential material that is needed to be included in Applicants' specification to satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, because topological sorting, in general, is extremely well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed, by way of example, referring to MPEP 2163, with respect to the written description requirement, there is an inverse correlation between the level of skill and knowledge in the art and the specificity of disclosure necessary to satisfy the written description requirement. It is axiomatic under the Patent laws that information that is well-known in the art does not have to be described in detail in the specification. Here,

37 CFR
1.121(c)(2)
NO!

Admission

one of ordinary skill in the related art reading Applicants' specification would not require a detailed explanation of "topological sorting" to understand the invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The claims were objected to for the reasons set forth on pages 3-6 of the Office Action. Applicants believe that all claim objections have been addressed by the claim amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 63 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 6 of the Office Action. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection, claim 63 has been amended to delete the phrase "selecting sort criteria".

Claims 23, 49, 63 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 7 of the Office Action. With respect to claims 63 and 64, the above claim amendments are believed to have further clarified claims 63 and 64 .

Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 23 and 49, as the subject matter is clear and definite. The claims recite, inter alia, "constructing a union between a set including a second object and a set including changed fragments needed to construct the second object for at least one edge which begins with the second object and terminates in the first object and for which the second object has changed. Examiner is respectfully directed to page 16, line 17 – page 17, line 12, for example.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 16-22 and 42-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082.to Ferrel. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. At the very least, the inventions of claims 16 and 42 are not anticipated by Ferrel.

Claim 16 is directed to a method for publishing a plurality of objects comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of objects, including compound objects;
partitioning at least some of the plurality of objects into a plurality of groups such that if two compound objects are constructed from at least one common changed fragment, then the compound objects are placed in a same group; and
publishing all objects belonging to a same group together.

On Page 9 of the Office Action, Examiner contends that Ferrel discloses *a plurality of objects including compound objects*, wherein Web pages are “objects” and “compound objects” since the Web pages include multiple components (which components Examiner interprets as fragments”).

Examiner then contends essentially that Ferrel discloses (Col. 29, lines 16-18; and Col. 28, lines 49-55) *partitioning at least some of the plurality of objects* (i.e., the plurality of Web pages) *into a plurality of groups* (i.e., plurality of sections) *such that if two compound objects* (i.e., if two Web pages) *are constructed from at least one common changed fragment* (i.e., constructed from one common changed component), *then the compound objects* (i.e., Web pages) *are placed in a same group* (i.e., the Web pages are placed in a same section).

It is respectfully submitted that the above interpretation and analysis is flawed for several

reasons. First, as is apparent from the above comparison between the claim language and Examiner's interpretation of the claim language with respect to the cited sections of Ferrel, it is clear that such interpretation does not make any logical or technical sense. To reiterate, Examiner essentially contends that Ferrel discloses partitioning at least some of the plurality of Web pages into a plurality of sections such that if two Web pages are constructed from at least one common changed component, then the Web pages are placed in a same section. There is simply no basis for such interpretation of Ferrel much less the invention of claim 16.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Ferrel does not teach in Col. 28, lines 49-55 and Col. 29, lines 16-18, what is contended in the Office Action. In particular, with respect to Col. 29, lines 16-18, Ferrel does not disclose or suggest that "web pages are organized into sections" as contended. In fact, Ferrel merely discloses that a "title object", which is a container for sections and pages, may contain pages and search objects that are organized into sections and subsections (see, Col. 29, lines 13-16). Clearly, the "title object" does not constitute a web page" that is partitioned into sections.

Moreover, it is unclear how Col 28, lines 49-55, of Ferrel can be interpreted as disclosing "web pages containing common updated fragments are placed in a same group" as contended in the Office Action. Indeed, Col 28, lines 49-55 merely discusses the content and structure of a "project object."

Next, keeping with Examiner's interpretation of web pages as being organized into sections (as an interpretation of the claimed "a plurality of objects partitioned into groups"), it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis for the contention that Ferrel discloses (Col. 29, lines 62 through Col 30, line 29) publishing all web pages belonging to a same section together or, as interpreted by Examiner, the web pages comprising the section are pressed at once. There is a

stark difference between “publishing all web pages that belong to the same section” as compared to “publishing all web pages comprising (or including) the section”. These interpretations are inconsistent on their face.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, the invention of claim 16 is not anticipated by Ferrel. In addition, claim 42 is not anticipated by Ferrel for at least the same reasons given for claim 16. Moreover, dependent claims 17-22 and 43-48 are not anticipated by Ferrel for at least the same reasons give above for respective base claims 16 and 42. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 8-15, 23-29, 34-41, 49-53, 55-65, and 67-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel in view of Cormen. Independent claims 1, 27, 53, and 61 have been amended. As such, the specific obviousness rejections of such claims, as well as the corresponding dependent claims, as set forth on page 12-31 are essentially no longer applicable. However, Applicants respectfully submit that at the very minimum, claims 1, 27, 53 and 61 are non-obvious and patentable over the combination of Ferrel and Cormen.

For instance, with respect to claims 1, 27 and 61, it is respectfully submitted that overall, the cited combination does not disclose or suggest, for example, *representing relationships or inclusion relationships between objects in a plurality of objects using at least one graph, traversing the at least one graph to determine an order in which to construct one or more objects in the plurality of objects based on the one or more relationships or inclusion relationships, constructing the one or more objects based on the determined order, and publishing the one or more constructed objects*, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 27 and/or 61.

More specifically, Ferrel does not disclose or suggest *representing relationships or inclusion relationships between objects in a plurality of objects using at least one graph*.

Although Ferrel discloses an acyclic graph (data structure) as a means for storing related and ordered objects, Ferrel does not disclose or suggest that such graph represents relationships or inclusion relationships between objects. Such acyclic graph is merely a graphical representation illustrating the document or page structure, illustrating the ordering of objects. This is much different from a graph that illustrates relationships or dependencies between objects, as contemplated by the claimed inventions.

Moreover, Ferrel does not disclose *traversing the at least one graph to determine an order in which to construct one or more objects in the plurality of objects based on the one or more inclusion relationships*. Ferrel discloses in Col. 29, lines 50-55, that content is sorted at pressing time, wherein the “sort order” is specified by the designer based on priority of content and Date Time. Moreover, Ferrel discloses in Col. 53, lines 36-50 that an object (title) is instantiated by first creating a parse tree that represents the structure of the title object. Although Ferrel discloses that a sorting algorithm can be used to order the content that is placed in the parse tree (Col. 53, lines 45-47), this is very much different than traversing a graph to determine an order in which to construct objects based on object relationships or inclusion relationships as represented by a graph. In other words, Ferrel uses a sorting process to generate (populate) a parse tree, whereas the claimed invention includes traversing a graph to determine an order to construct objects based on object relationships specified in the graph. Cormen does not cure the deficiencies of Ferrel in this regard.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, claims 1, 27 and 61, and all pending dependent claims, are patentable and nonobvious over the combination of Ferrel and Cormen.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 53, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's reliance on Col. 9, lines 30-31, as disclosing an "acyclic graph" is misplaced. To begin, the Ferrel systems and methods do not implement an acyclic graph. Rather, Ferrel expressly implements what is referred to as a COS (cache object store) for storing MP system objects, not an acyclic graph. Thus, there is no basis for contending that Ferrel discloses *constructing at least one graph, the at least one graph including nodes representing objects in the plurality of objects and edges for connecting nodes having relationships, at least some of the edges being derived from at least one consistency constraint, and finding at least one strongly connected component in the at least one graph*, as essentially claimed in claim 53. Accordingly, the combination of Ferrel and Cormen is legally deficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 53. Therefore, claim 53 and all pending claims that depend from claim 53, are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over at least the combination of Cormen with Ferrel.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
East Meadow, New York 11553
TEL: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092